Hoch- FBI Releases

Dear Paul, 1/3/78

Glad to get your letter of the 30 and enclosed lists and Reuters story.

I respond in haste because some of these things can be of value in several cases including the newest, which includes remission of fees. Temporarily we can't do anything because Jim has one of the currently popular bugs, one of those reluctant to leave.

If I am unclear please ask. I may be going into Frederick. If I do I'll mail this to save a day over tomorrow's mail. However, I've lost the morning and part of the afternoon because of a trip to my Washington dentist and currently my mind is concentrating on not indulging nausea. I've been off the anti-coagulent for three days not to bleed at the extraction, was under instrictions to take a heavy dose as soon as I got home, and I don't want to lose it because I'd fear taking more.

I still have heard nothong from the AIB. Which means they are confirming my low opinion of them. My requests of them was for those records they discussed publicly that can be of value in my FOIA suits. Which you certainly know after Post Mortem are not for my writing. They haven't even been decent enough to acknolwedge receipt. On their side they have been stealing and selling for years. They have even stole and distributed as their own original work what is uniquely photocipied from my published work. With this and a more dubious history if they can't send me a few xeroxes that will do me no personal good I can make other suggestions directed at what they can do with them.

I think I pointed out the error in the Post story. If you want a copy of the complaint let me know, not Jim. Easier for me. There was a Star story Sunday. I've not yet read it. From wha Jim read to me there is selective use of quotes, without omissions not indicated, out of context use of correct quotes and a few things I certainly did not say, if at all, as represented. That woman phoned me 12/7. The story appeared 1/1/78. Not angled as she said in phoning me.

The Reuters wire copy may be of help to Jim when he arges or briefs the fee remission case. I'll get a copy to him.

This can also be true of some of the clippings on your lists. I've gone over them and place a mraginal O where I am sure I have the stories. The others I do not have or may have in a different version, which can mean do not have, depending on the nature of the omissions and editing. I'll copy this and return.

I have put a ? opposite your 30, the Post's Lardner/Claiborne story. Here there also can be an edition difference because I have that story. If I undersatnd what you say there are "(2 versions)." I have but one, from the early edition of the Post.

(BY the way, I also have the Times/Crawdson FOIA series.)

I've also made notes in themargin of your documents lists #s 52-71. Here I've put a checl alongside those I think we can use in court or I can use to help turn the press from nuttiness. The two?s are because those seem familiar but are not identical withwhat I recall. 62-2933: the misspelling seems to make it what I have ("Connelly") but the quasi-SBT does not really fit. And with the next, Seroal 2039, the description is not identical but the content appears to be. You ask about CD 5. The copy I have uses the language of the CD5 records I use in PM but in quotes. They sent an FD302 quoting what Shanklin sent and there is in CD5 what the agents wrote earlier, as I recall it.

If you haveany opinions about how these can be used in the FOIA cases please suggest. And with others. Almost anything from the Lab is of value because we also filed for discovery and in ther responses received none of this stuff.

Thanks and best wishes,